PATENT COOPERATION THEAT

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY WRITTEN OPINION OF THE see form PCT/ISA/220 INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION see form PCT/ISA/220 See paragraph 2 below International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) International application No. 31.07.2003 30.07.2004 PCT/EP2004/008587 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC A61K31/165, A61K47/32, A61K47/38 Applicant CALLUNA PHARMA BVBA This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: 1. Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability ☐ Box No. III ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial Box No. V applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Certain documents cited Box No. VI Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application **FURTHER ACTION** 2. If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. 3.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:

Authorized Officer



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Zimmer, B

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8600



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/008587

IAPS Rec'd PCT/PTO 3 0 JAN 2006

10/566356

	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion	07 200 250
1.	With regard	I to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the period it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.	e international application in
	langua	binion has been established on the basis of a translation from the originge , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purpose Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).	nal language into the following es of international search
2.	With regard	d to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the into the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the bas	ernational application and is of:
	a. type of r	naterial:	
	□ as	equence listing	
	□ tab	le(s) related to the sequence listing	
	b. format o	f material:	
	□ in v	written format	
	□ in o	computer readable form	
	c. time of f	iling/furnishing:	
	□ со	ntained in the international application as filed.	
	☐ file	d together with the international application in computer readable form	1.
	☐ fui	nished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.	
3	has b copie	dition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence list een filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the is is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the priate, were furnished.	ne subsequent or additional
4	Additional	comments:	

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/008587

Вс	x No. II	Priority
. 🗵	The fol	llowing document has not been furnished:
	8	copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
		translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b))
	Conse	equently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has heless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.
2. 🗆	has be	, pinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claren found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Ac	ditional d	observations, if necessary:
Be in	ox No. V dustrial	Reasoned statement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
in	dustrial	applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
in 1. St	dustrial atement	applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
in 1. St	dustrial	applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
in 1. St No	dustrial attement ovelty (N)	applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims
in 1. St No	dustrial atement	applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims
in I. St No In	dustrial atement ovelty (N) ventive s	applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims Step (IS) Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims
in I. St No In	dustrial atement ovelty (N) ventive s	applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims Step (IS) Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims
in I. St No In	dustrial atement ovelty (N) ventive s	applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims Step (IS) Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims applicability (IA) Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims
in II. St No In In	dustrial atement ovelty (N) ventive s dustrial a	applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims Step (IS) Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims applicability (IA) Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims Applicability (IA) Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims
in II. St No In In	dustrial atement ovelty (N) ventive s dustrial a	applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims Step (IS) Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims applicability (IA) Yes: Claims 1-10 No: Claims

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Reference is made to the following document/s/:

D1: EP-A-0 014 437 (SCHERING CORP) 20 August 1980 (1980-08-20)

D2: EP-A-0 546 018 (SCHERING CORP) 16 June 1993 (1993-06-16)

D3: WO 98/41207 A (BROWN SCOTT A ;UPJOHN CO (US)) 24 September

1998 (1998-09-24)

D4: WO 02/41899 A (PHOENIX SCIENT INC) 30 May 2002 (2002-05-30)

2. Novelty

D1 discloses (i) an oral suspension of florfenicol comprising purified water, propylene glycol and colloidal magnesium aluminium silicate and (ii) an injectable florfenicol solution comprising N,N-dimethylacetamide.

The oral suspension (i) is not suitable for injection as it comprises purified water and the injectable solution (ii) is - due to the presence of N,N-dimethylacetamide - a non ageuous solution and no aqueous suspension.

The other documents D2-D4 disclose injectable florfenicol compositions, which differ from the subject-matter of the present application in that they do not contain water and are thus not aqueous.

As a result, the subject-matter of claims 1-10 of the present application seems to be new in view of the cited prior art (Art. 33(2) PCT).

Inventive step

The technical problem of the present application is the provision of an alternative injectable formulation of florfenicol.

The solution of the problem by the provision of an aqueous injectable suspension is not obvious in view of the cited prior art; especially in view of D2, which states that aqueous injectable solutions of florfenicol are not practicable due to the low

International application No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/EP2004/008587

solubility of florfenicol in water.

As there is no hint in any of the cited prior art documents that florfenicol, which is of low water solubility, leads to a stable suspension in water without any further addition of organic solvent, the subject-matter of the present application seems to involve an inventive step (Art. 33(3) PCT).

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

For clarity reasons of independent claim 1 the term "aqueous" should be substituted by the definition given on p.2, last but one paragraph of the description.